

**R4 Report
Fiscal Year 2002**

**United States Agency for International Development
Bureau for Humanitarian Response**

**Office of Food for Peace - Strategic Objective 2
"Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II
development activities with measurable results related to food
security with a primary focus on household nutrition
and agricultural productivity"**

26 May 2000

Please Note:

The attached FY 2002 Results Review and Resource Request ("R4") was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on this cover page.

The R4 is a "pre-decisional" USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106
Fax: 703/351-4039
Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org
Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after Oct. 1, 2002

COVER MEMO

MEMORANDUM

May 5, 2000

TO: Len Rogers, DAA/BHR

THRU: William T. Oliver, BHR/FFP

FROM: Rich Newberg, BHR/FFP/DP

SUBJECT: FY 2002 Results Report and Resource Request

The Office of Food for Peace Non-Emergency Strategic Objective 2 team is pleased to present the FY 2002 Results Report. The FY02 R2 summarizes progress to date in achieving SO2: **Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.**

During FY 1999, a wide range of successes were reported by the Cooperating Sponsors (CSs) that demonstrate significant impacts on the lives and wellbeing of the poor, food insecure populations targeted by Title II non-emergency programs. Agricultural productivity and rural incomes increased, the health and nutrition of mothers and children improved, and access to basic education, especially for girls, increased.

A number of factors continue to influence the Office of Food for Peace SO2 team's ability to strengthen the capacities of their partners to achieve measurable food security results. Inadequate USAID staff levels and OE resources constrain our ability to pay quality attention to CS activities and proposals. These resource constraints are compounded by the challenges of managing multiple and often conflicting legal requirements and other external influences, such as the desire to decrease the proportion of resources monetized while encouraging growth in the program overall, and managing growth while maintaining a quality focus on programming for sustainable food security impacts.

During FY 2000 and FY 2001, the SO2 team will be developing a **new Strategic Plan** (SP) for the Strategic Objective. The team proposes to increase the focus of the new SP on the food security results achieved by Title II development partners, while still placing equal attention on building the capacity of our partners and food aid managers. Consistent with the changes made at the IR level during the past year, the new SP will not include the internal processes of the office. Rather, the team will monitor and track internal efficiency through improved and more accountable Work Objectives and the Annual Evaluation Process for SO2 team members, and also through our institutional support contractor.

In order to address staffing shortages, the team suggests that FFP positions be declared as high priority placements, in order to attract qualified staff to the position. In the past the Agency has declared certain positions to be "critical shortage" positions to ensure they will be filled. The team recommends that consideration be given to authorizing the hiring of PCSs for non-emergency activities. It should be noted that this would require a legislative change. A priority will be given to recruitment efforts for existing positions. One GS Country Backstop Officer (CBO) has been assigned to FFP, and plans are underway to hire an additional two GS CBOs over the next 3-4 months.

As part of a multi-faceted strategy to broaden the amount and sources of cash resources necessary to support Title II development programming, the team proposes that "cost sharing" be rewarded in new DAPs. The team proposes that DAPs that meet technical review criteria be prioritized based on percent of cost-share. Further, the team proposes that DAPs which integrate Mission or other donor funding also be accorded similar priority.

The new Farm Bill scheduled for FY 2002 provides a critical opportunity for the Agency to encourage the Hill to review and revise the mandates. The mandates must be achievable and strike a proper balance between processed and bulk commodities and direct distribution and monetization activities. At a minimum, the new farm bill should reflect an understanding of the results we are able to achieve due to monetization and direct distribution, and permit the Agency to grow both sides of the program.

PART 1: OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

A. INTRODUCTION

Food security is often the most important, fundamental concern facing the poorest members of developing countries. The real third world - 840 million hungry people, including 180 million malnourished children - are the focus of USAID's non-emergency food aid programs.

The United States P.L. 480 Title II non-emergency food aid program constitutes the single largest source of USAID funding focused on food security, and enjoys substantial support from a unique combination of political, agricultural, commercial and non-governmental sectors. The Office of Food for Peace SO2 team administers Title II non-emergency programs - a \$400 million dollar development portfolio. In the past year, approximately 80% of Title II development funding supported activities directed at improving household nutrition (including water and sanitation activities) and agricultural productivity (including natural resource management), the priority technical areas of intervention designed to attack the root causes of food insecurity (see table 1). Priority was also given to expanding Title II development activities in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia—the most chronically food insecure regions of the world.

U.S. food assistance is grounded in American humanitarianism. It also benefits the U.S. economy both directly and indirectly, through the purchase of U.S. goods and services and by promoting economic growth in recipient countries. As incomes in developing countries rise, consumption patterns change and imports increase. Aid leads to trade, and Americans exporters benefit.

B. OVERVIEW

In FY 2000, the Office of Food for Peace SO2 team will support 17 NGO Cooperating Sponsors (CSs) implementing 79 Title II non-emergency activities in 20 Sub-Saharan Africa countries, 2 countries in South Asia, and 6 countries in Latin America (see appendix table 1 for a list of FY 2000 programs.) The total FY 2000 approved value¹ of these activities is \$348 million, complemented by \$10.6 million in section 202(e) cash funding to cover the dollar costs associated with field implementation of Title II food aid activities. In addition, the FFP SO2 portion of the Development Assistance (DA) portfolio supports technical assistance provided through the Institutional Support Agreement (ISA) program, a Cooperative Agreement with Michigan State University (MSU), a Johns Hopkins University (JHU) Fellow and a cooperative agreement with the Food and Nutrition technical assistance (FANta) project.

Title II development activities support interventions in 6 technical areas, with a focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity (see table 1.)

2. Total value includes commodity plus freight.

Table 1. FY 2000 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives by Food Security Component.		
Food security component	Percent of total commodity volume	Percent of total value (commodity + freight)
Health & Nutrition	32.3	37.2
Water & Sanitation	7.0	6.0
Agriculture	42.5	37.9
Education	11.49.0	11.0
Micro-Enterprise	1.1	1.2
General Relief	7.6	7.8
Total FY 2000 Title II Development Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives (approved as of 3/15/00)	939,481 MT	\$348.3 Million
Title II Development Funding through the World Food Program (approximate 5/5/00)	103,109 MT	\$38 Million
Total FY 2000 Title II Development Funding	1,042,590 MT	\$386.3 Million

C. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE

Management challenges at CS Headquarters

The number of Title II non-emergency programs being implemented by CSs has increased noticeably over the past few years (from 59 in 1998 to approximately 80 in 2000). The steady growth in monetization has increased the burden on CSs in managing the complex commodity sales process. In addition, a number of CSs are implementing programs to decentralize management to field offices. The SO2 team has been supporting capacity strengthening of CS headquarters staff through the ISAs, but the CSs still need to institutionalize their internal capacity building efforts. It is a formidable challenge because of the growth in numbers of activities and staff turnover. These factors combine to make it more difficult for CS headquarters to maintain quality control over what is submitted to the SO2 team for approval, and to rapidly respond to requests for required documentation and information.

Inadequate staffing at FFP

While not as acute a problem as it was in 1998 when all the Country Backstop Officers (CBOs) were new to FFP/W, lack of sufficient staffing continues to be a negative factor, ultimately affecting the performance of the CSs. Insufficient staff and excessive numbers of programs per CBO have contributed to delays in program approvals, and, in some cases, less than ideal quality of the reviews. It is clear that most of the CBOs don't have the reasonable work load, which, given the complexities of managing food aid programs, should be 2 or 3 countries with an average of 4 activities each. The number of countries currently backstopped by a CBO averages 5-6. It should be noted that irrespective of the success or failure of our efforts under the SO, missions are delegated certain responsibilities related to the review, approval and oversight of Title II non-emergency activities. However, countries where there is no mission (non-presence countries), do contribute significantly to an increased workload for the CBOs.

Delays in program approval

The challenges faced by both the SO2 team and CS headquarters have resulted in delays in program approval, which in turn contributes to delays in obtaining the resources to begin program implementation. This has led, in some cases, to delays in the implementation of baseline surveys, and to difficulties in achieving performance targets. (The data to support this conclusion is discussed in the Results Review section of this Results Report.)

Attempts to control program growth lead to a focus on reengineering

During FY 2000, faced with an inadequate response from the Agency to requests to increase FFP staff and OE resources, and CS difficulties in managing an ever increasing number of programs, the SO2 team proposed that a cap be placed on the number of Title II non-emergency programs. However, the CS representatives on the Food Aid Consultative Group (FACG) rejected the proposal, and clearly want the program to continue to grow.

When the FACG rejected the proposal to cap the number of programs, the SO2 team looked at other strategies for reducing workload while continuing to meet fiduciary responsibilities. Several actions were taken to reduce documentation requirements and shorten the amount of time necessary to process new activity and annual incremental funding approvals.

During FY 2000, the team also started to investigate reengineering options that would allow the team to manage larger units; to reduce the number of discrete activities and the number of transactions associated with each activity; to deal with programs more in the aggregate and at the strategic, rather than project level; and increase the focus on results with a concomitant decreased focus on the input-output dynamic. This process continues (Also see pp. 10 – 11).

Meeting the mandates

The team continued to face challenges in meeting the often conflicting P.L. 480 legislative mandates (sub-minimum, 75% value-added) while at the same time addressing the sustainable food security objectives of the program as contained in the legislation and Agency policy. The new Farm Bill scheduled for FY 2002 provides a critical opportunity for the Agency to encourage the Hill to review and revise the mandates. The mandates must be achievable and strike a proper balance between processed and bulk commodities and direct distribution and monetization activities. At a minimum, the new farm bill should reflect an understanding of the results we are able to achieve due to monetization and direct distribution, and permit the Agency to grow both sides of the program.

Monetization challenges

Recently, Congress, the Office of the Inspector General and the Office of Management and Budget have addressed problems associated with the implementation and management aspects of monetization activities. By their nature activities supported by monetization are higher risk with a potential for activity disruption associated with the relative success or failure of the monetization transaction. Discussions continued in the FACG in order to address the concerns of both the PVO implementing partners and the producer groups. The team placed increased attention on ensuring commercial trade was not affected by monetization activities while maintaining the availability of critical monetized resources for the implementation of sustainable food security programs. For the first time since the Agency Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper was approved, the percentage of the program which is direct distribution increased, although slightly.

Cost-share

In order to continue efforts to bring Title II non-emergency program procedures more in line with DA procedures, and as part of a multifaceted strategy to increase the cash resources available to support Title II programs, the team proposes that "cost sharing" be rewarded in new DAPs. The team proposes that DAPs that meet technical review criteria be prioritized based on percent of cost-share; and that priority also be given to DAPs that integrate mission or other donor funding.

PART II: RESULTS REVIEW

HEADER: BHR/FFP/DP, Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity, 962-002-01

OFFICE SELF ASSESSMENT: Not Meeting

SUMMARY:

BHR/FFP Strategic Objective 2 contributes to the achievement of numerous Agency Strategic Objectives, including: (roughly in order of Title II's contribution):

- ◆ Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced.
- ◆ More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged.
- ◆ Sustainable management of natural resources increased.
- ◆ Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and child birth reduced.
- ◆ Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded.
- ◆ Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable.
- ◆ The development of politically active civil society promoted.
- ◆ The potential impact of crises reduced.
- ◆ HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced.

The goal of Title II development programs is to improve household nutrition and agricultural productivity among targeted vulnerable groups. The team hopes to achieve this goal through the SO2: *increased effectiveness of FFP's PVO and Mission partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security, with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity*. As steps toward achieving the SO2, the team has identified two key intermediate results. These intermediate results are:

IR1: *Strengthened capabilities* of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor, and support programs; and

IR2: *Improved integration* of programs with other in-country activities, with USAID Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies.

Additionally, two other parts of the SO2 statement are important to achieving the goal, namely, measurable results related to food security, and a focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.

The ultimate "customers" of the SO2 team are the portion of more than 800 million food insecure people worldwide who receive P.L. 480 food assistance. Our partners are USAID Missions, USAID/W Regional Bureaus, all levels of host governments, PVOs,

CDOs, IOs, NGOs, and other food aid donors. Within this panoply of partners, Cooperating Sponsors (PVOs/CDOs/IOs) are particularly important for SO2. These entities are prime instruments in the delivery of Title II development assistance.

The SO2 team utilizes its resources and concentrates its efforts on strengthening its partners' capabilities to implement Title II development programs by providing policy and operational guidance, technical assistance, and self-help resources. The SO2 and its indicators are defined in terms of the degree to which its partners are able to achieve the people-level targets that they establish in their activities (DAPs). Consistent with the *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper*, the *managing-for-results* system falls primarily on the PVO/CDOs and USAID Missions, and in turn, these field managers are given flexibility to propose activities they believe will have the greatest food security impacts. It is important that these results be measurable and focussed in the areas of household nutrition and agricultural productivity.

KEY RESULTS:

One key IR indicator on which the SO2 team wishes to focus this results reporting period is the capacity of the CSs to design quality Title II development proposals (IR Performance Indicator 1.1a.). This indicator, measured by an assessment of factors judged by FFP and other partners, continued to improve. For the fourth year in a row, the percent of approved DAPs that met review criteria increased, to 67%, although it fell short of reaching the FY 1999 target of 70% (Performance Indicator Table 3). Significantly, the focus of those proposals continues to be on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.

CSs continued to face challenges in the implementation of a results-driven management system, as indicated by a decreasing percentage of baselines being established in a timely manner (SO Performance Indicator 2), and decreased percent of targets achieved (SO Performance Indicator 3), even though the percent of CSs that report on results increased. The difficulties CSs face in keeping up with the pace of growth in Title II non-emergency activities, in some cases because of emergency requirements, leave the SO2 team and the missions with an elusive and challenging target in improving CS capacity, and more importantly, a stretched CS capacity to adequately implement and monitor programs.

Paradoxically, and similar to last year, many improvements in food security in target populations were documented during FY 1999 (see Information Annex: Success Stories.) Agricultural productivity and rural incomes were increased, the health and nutrition of mothers and children were improved, and access to basic education, especially for girls, was increased.

PERFORMANCE AND PROSPECTS

Continued improvements in the quality of program proposals

For the fourth year in a row, the percent of approved DAPs that met review criteria increased, to 67%, although it fell short of reaching the FY 1999 target of 70% (Performance Indicator Table 3). CSs continue to improve their skills at drafting and submitting proposals that are complete, and programmatically and technically sound. Presumably, this is a reflection of improvements in the guidance they are receiving, and a strengthening of their own capacities to conceptualize food security strategies and activities. One would hope that the quality of proposals also means that those programs are more sound and that CS capacity to implement them is also improved.

Retrogression in establishment of baselines in a timely manner

The increase in the quality of program proposals has not been mirrored by continued increases in the establishment of the basis for performance monitoring (implementation of a baseline and definition of performance targets within the first year of program implementation). Delays in receiving monetization funds and the growth in CS activities have contributed to delays in the design and implementation of baseline surveys for several CSs, leading to a decrease in the percent of programs establishing a baseline and performance targets in the first year of program implementation from, 100% in FY 1998 to only 44% in FY 1999 (Performance Data Table 1.)

Results reporting by implementing partners increased

Notwithstanding the delays in implementation of baselines, the CSs' overall capacity for performance reporting continues to show improvements. The percent of programs that track and report achievements versus targets for performance indicators increased from 52% in FY 1998 to 71% in FY 1999.² However, this may be the result of a greater number of program's reaching a stage and maturity where results reporting is now possible.

Results achievement by implementing partners decreased

In FY 99, program implementation was disrupted by a combination of natural disasters and serious management problems. Consequently, implementation targets were adversely impacted. While performance reporting (and possibly the capacity for performance reporting) did increase, the effectiveness of the CSs in achieving the food security results they set did not meet performance targets. Indeed, a lower percent of targets were met in FY 1999 than were met in FY 1998 (Performance Data Table 2). However, the results reported for FY 1999 cover a larger number and proportion of programs (39 programs representing approximately 71% of programs that should have reported performance results, compared with 23 programs presenting 52% of programs in

² As of the date that the FFP/DP Results Reports were submitted.

FY 1998). The decline in the percent of results achieved is much less pronounced when the smaller set of programs that reported results both years are considered. The average percent of results achieved was 66% in FY 1998 compared with 65% in FY 1999 for this smaller subset of programs. Nonetheless, neither set of FY 1999 results comes close to the 80% target set by the team.

Food security results and impacts

The SO2 indicator of percent of targets achieved is an imperfect measure of performance. The indicator measures whether the target was achieved by at least 100%, rather than assessing the degree to which targets were met, or results achieved. It only means that the improvements achieved were not as great as the CS had predicted. And although the percent of results achieved did not meet targets, the CSs do show impressive improvements in the food security of target populations. The Information Annex: Success Stories captures the following real advances achieved by Title II development programs in important food security areas.

Title II programs are making people's lives better

◆ **Agricultural Productivity**

- ◆ Agricultural productivity and incomes improve in Mozambique
- ◆ More efficient water use helps poor farmers in Eritrea
- ◆ Improved watershed management results in a wide range of benefits for Bihar tribals in India
- ◆ Improved management of natural resources helps increase access to water in arid areas of Ethiopia
- ◆ Kenyan farmer and mother benefits from improved irrigation
- ◆ Food security of both rural and urban poor improved in Cape Verde
- ◆ Sustainable rural enterprises create jobs and reduce rural poverty in Ghana
- ◆ Honduran farmers produce a timely surplus in the aftermath of Mitch
- ◆ Title II-funded program collaboration with an International Agricultural Research Center improves crop production in India
- ◆ Increased production, improved storage and better diets lead to healthier and better nourished Ghanaian children

◆ **Household nutrition**

- ◆ Severely malnourished children in Peru regain good nutritional status
- ◆ Ethiopian children and their mothers are healthier and better nourished
- ◆ Integrated program results in decreased malnutrition and improved health for women and children in Bolivia
- ◆ Healthy pregnancies, healthy babies for women in India
- ◆ Maternal health programs address cultural constraint to improved women's health in Ghana
- ◆ Ensuring the future sustainability of maternal and child health and nutrition programs in Peru

◆ **Basic Education**

- ◆ Haiti's most vulnerable children are getting a better education
- ◆ Title II food helps girls stay in school in Ghana
- ◆ Better micronutrient status and improved health help improve learning in Burkina Faso
- ◆ Learning new learning methods helps Indian teachers teach better

◆ **General Relief**

- ◆ Non-emergency programs are there for vulnerable groups

In order to reflect more clearly where programs have been relatively more effective in meeting food security goals, the team disaggregated the percent of results achieved indicator by technical sector. This disaggregation demonstrates that the percent of results achieved in the priority sectors where the bulk of Title II resources are being programmed (Maternal/Child Health and Nutrition and Agricultural Productivity) is higher than the percent of results achieved in sectors where a smaller proportion of the resources have been programmed. This represents a significant accomplishment of SO2, that the team has effectively transformed over time the composition of food security activities into technical and sectoral areas where the activities are achieving significant food security results and impacts.

Table 2. Average Percent of FY 1999 Results Achieved by Technical Sector	
Technical Sector	Percent of results achieved
Agriculture	65
Health & Nutrition	62
Natural Resource Management	57
Micro-Enterprise	57
Water & Sanitation	52
Education	50
Non-Emergency Humanitarian Relief	N/A

Factors affecting future performance

Begin planning for a new round of ISAs

At the end of FY 1998, FFP awarded new 3 to 5 year Institutional Strengthening Agreements (ISAs) to 14 CSs, at a total LOA value of approximately \$24 million. The ISAs constitute an important component of FFP's strategy to increase the effectiveness of

the implementing partners through strengthened capacity of headquarters and field staff, and improved cooperation and collaboration between CSs. The challenges faced by growth in the program and the likelihood that reengineering will affect CSs argue strongly for continued support and a review of the appropriate timeframe, content, and flexibility of ISAs.

Redelegation

Partly to meet the wider objective of integration of the food aid program into country and regional programs and to ease the management burden, the team developed a strategy to strengthen the field Mission's role in the program approval process, by redelegating PAA approval authority to selected Mission's that met management and program integration criteria. During FY 1999, the team targeted two additional Missions for redelegation, to bring the total of redelegated Missions to 5 (Performance Data Table 4). This target was achieved with the signing of MOUs with Mozambique and Peru.

The greatest impetus for redelegation has been the declining availability of DA resources. At the same time the redelegation process is being implemented when there has been an overall downsizing of USAID's overseas presence. Missions targeted for redelegation, and some of the already redelegated Missions, have expressed concerns about their continued ability to provide the required Title II program management. In addition, the team started a process of reengineering Title II that may result in significant changes in the way Title II resources are managed, most likely relying on continued or growing Mission assumption of management responsibilities.

For these reasons, the team has decided to put further redelegation on hold during FY 2000. The team is currently conducting a survey of redelegated Missions to determine strengths and weaknesses of the strategy, and how redelegation might fit into a reengineered Title II development program.

Reengineering office procedures

Beginning in FY 1999, the SO2 team undertook a series of activities designed to address inefficiencies in management and logistics. One recommendation that resulted from the review of the BHR/FFP SO2 FY 2001 R4 was that a "blue ribbon" panel be constituted to examine and recommend solutions to the food security and management issues facing the SO2 team. One of the first tasks the group prioritized was a management study to identify ways of improving the quality of Title II non-emergency programming while streamlining management in a downsizing environment. The study, "Assessment of the Management of PL 480, Title II Non-Emergency Resources Strategic Objective No. 2", was completed in November 1999. The conclusions of the report are already being incorporated in the reengineering process.

One area the Sykes/Chandler study team and CSs recommended that FFP management explore was the comparison of Title II activity procedures with those of USDA Food for Progress and 416(b) programs. FFP commissioned a second study to carry out this

comparison to identify “best practices” and streamlined procedures under USDA programs that might be adopted by the team. The comparison study was completed in January 2000, and came to the conclusion that the legislative and institutional goals take each of the agencies in a different direction. However, there may be some opportunity for collaboration on procedural improvements.

The SO2 team also identified several actions to reduce documentation requirements and shorten the amount of time necessary to process program approvals. The use of the new Transfer Authorization (TA) format has helped consolidate program documentation through a single formal agreement between the Agency and the Cooperating Sponsor.

Reengineering CS guidance

During FY 1999, the team began discussing internally, then externally with the FACG , options for reengineering the Title II development (non-emergency) program approval system. Reengineering is deemed necessary due to:

- A doubling of approved programs over the past three years;
- Continued staff shortages in FFP/DP;
- Limited capacity of CSs and FFP to keep up with program growth;
- Constructive CS criticism of current program requirements;
- Increased USAID Mission interest in Title II resources, while at the same time facing their own OE cuts;
- The current focus on detailed annual reviews and lack of attention to results;
- The need to decrease number of FFP management units by moving to larger grants or cooperative agreements; and,
- The need for a variety of flexible models in Title II programs to meet the differing needs of cooperating sponsors, missions, and country situations.

Several discussions on the reengineering process were held with the FACG. Initially, the team proposed that a small task force with representation from USAID, USDA, CSs and the producer groups be tasked with developing a work plan for determining the shape of a reengineered Title II development program. However, the current process is that initial conceptualization and drafting is performed by the SO Team and draft products are discussed and vetted with the full FACG. Based on feedback from the group, priority has been placed on reengineering the current program approval process. The guidance for PAA documentation have been reduced for those programs that are on track with respect to results reporting and resource requests, and reduced to only several pieces of information for the second year of a DAP. The SO2 team is continuing to streamline review procedures by developing guidance for consolidating the PAA and Results Report documents into a single CS Results Report and Resource Request (CSR4), to be implemented in the FY 2002 cycle, and by developing new guidance for DAP and DAP Amendment documentation. CBO review worksheets for PAA, DAP, and DAP/A approvals have already been reworked for testing this review cycle.

One stated objective of the reengineering process is to identify options that would allow the team to manage fewer and larger grants; to reduce the number of discrete activities

and the number of transactions associated with each activity; to deal with programs more in the aggregate and at the strategic, rather than project level; and increase the focus on results with a concomitant decreased focus on the input-output dynamic. FFP management has consulted with grant specialists, and unfortunately, the move to larger grants may be at odds with either CSs desire for separate activities in the case of country level aggregation, or redelegation and country integration in the case of regional or sub-regional grants to individual CSs. A results orientation may also be at odds with recent attempts to conduct a more vigorous review of CS annual implementation plans.

POSSIBLE ADJUSTMENT TO PLANS

Strategic plan revision

In the FY 2001 R4, adjustments were made to the SO2 Results Framework by dropping a number of IR indicators. In addition, the team proposed that further review of the SO indicators and the Intermediate Results would be undertaken during FY 1999. Due to the initiation of a reengineering process, the review of the IRs and the performance reporting plan was put on hold. Given that FY2001 is the final year of the Strategic Plan (SP), however, the team will undertake a series of activities during FY2000 to review and revise the SP.

The team will most likely propose to increase the focus of the new SP on the food security results achieved by Title II development programs, while continuing to also place attention to building the capacity of our partners. Consistent with the changes made at the IR level during the past year, the new SP will not include the internal processes of the office. Rather, the team will monitor and track internal efficiency through improved and more accountable Work Objectives and the Annual Evaluation Process for SO team members as well through the institutional support contractor.

During FYs 2000 and 2001, the team will conduct an assessment of the implementation of the Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper since 1995 and develop case studies on how to conduct monetization for maximum food security benefit. The studies aim to assess the results achieved due to the new policies contained in the Policy Paper and how well they have been implemented by the CSs, identify “best practices” and successes in the different technical sectors prioritized in the Policy Paper, examine the impact of monetization activities on food security, and review how new factors and policy priorities (e.g. HIV/AIDS) might have an impact on the ability to continue to achieve sustainable food security results. The assessment and case studies will serve as a way to determine what constraints the CSs have been facing in achieving results, and what constraints they may face in the next five years. The assessment will also help provide an analytic foundation for the development of a food security strategic framework to be embodied in a new SO2 Strategic Plan.

OTHER DONOR PROGRAMS

Not applicable.

MAJOR CONTRACTORS AND GRANTEES

Aside from the 17 Cooperating Sponsors implementing Title II non-emergency programs (see Appendix Table 1):

Institutional Support Agreements – Adventist Development and Relief Agency, Africare, American Red Cross, Catholic Relief Services, CARE, Food Aid Management (CARE), Counterpart International, Food for the Hungry International, Opportunities Industrialization Centers International, Project Concern International, Save the Children Federation, Inc., Technoserve, Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance, World Vision, Inc.

FFP Institutional Support Contract - Mendez England & Associates

G/PHN Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) Project – Academy for Educational Development

G/EGAD Food Security II Project - Michigan State University

G/Env EPIQ

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 1

Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2: Percentage of partners' activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively-measurable indicators within first year of implementation.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of activities	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: PVO Results Reports.	1996	(baseline year)	39
	1997	60	88
Indicator Definition: FY 1999 Results Reports for FY1999-2003 DAPs were reviewed by an M&E technical expert who determined whether a baseline survey had been completed, and targets set within the first year of implementation (i.e. by the end of FY 1999).	1998	90	100
	1999	95	44
Comments: As of 5/12/00, FY 1999 Results Reports had been received for 83% of the DAPs that started operations in FY 1999 (9 out of 11). Of the 9 DAPs for which there is information, 44% had completed baseline data collection and set targets during the first year of operation.	2000	100	
	2001	100	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 2

Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 3: Percentage of partners' targets demonstrated to be achieved based on objectively measured indicators.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of targets achieved	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: PVO Results Reports (R2s)	1996		N/A
	1997	(baseline year)	69
Indicator Definition: Average percent of targets achieved across PVOs. Based on reporting by the PVO in their R2s. The performance indicators reported in each Results Report are identified by FFP's contractor M&E technical experts. The percent of performance indicator targets met or exceeded in the FY reported is calculated.	1998	75	67
	1999	80	61
Comments: To date (5/12/00), 83% of R2s received (39 of 47) reported achieved results compared with targets for annual performance indicators (i.e. indicators measured above the level of project outputs.) The remaining R2s only reported results (without targets) or did not report on indicators above the level of project outputs. About 14% of programs have not yet turned in Results Reports, which were due by 1/30/00.	2000	85	
	2001	90	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 3

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 1a: Percentage of approved DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of new approved DAPs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: DAP review scoring sheets	1996	(baseline year)	0
	1997	50	27
Indicator Definition: Reviewers assess the DAPs using 11 review criteria (broken down into 33 sub-criteria) on a scale of (1) Not true of this DAP, (2) True to some extent, (3) True to a great extent with a few exceptions, or (4) True without exception or qualification. Satisfying a criteria to "a great extent or better" is defined as scoring an average of 3 or above on each DAP review scoring criteria.	1998	60	50 (1)
	1999	70	67
Comments: (1) FY 1998 score revised to include scores from REST Ethiopia and CARE Bolivia, FY 1999 DAPs approved after FY 2001 R4 was submitted. Result is still 50%, because 50% of the additional DAPs included met the criteria.	2000	75	
	2001	80	

NOTE: The scored assessments of the DAPs based on the review criteria are NOT used as criteria for DAP approval. The scores are solely used to calculate the R4 indicators (SO2.1 and IR1.1a), and are not aggregated until the R4 process is underway. The FFP CBO does not receive the aggregated scores during the DAP review process.

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 4

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2b: Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for redelegating Title II program authority.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of Missions	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: FFP SO2 Team files	1996	0	0
	1997	3	0
Indicator Definition: (as stated above)	1998	6	3
	1999	5	5
Comments: Two new MOUs were signed during FY 1999 (Mozambique and Peru) for a cumulative total of 5 Missions with signed MOUs. Outyear targets have been revised downward because the team's MOU strategy has been put on hold until the reengineering process is completed. At that time the team will decide whether additional MOUs should be pursued.	2000	5 (6)*	
	2001	5 (6)*	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 5

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 3b: Percent of scores of "good" or "excellent" by PVOs/Missions on surveys of quality of FFP program support.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of scores 3 or greater on survey of quality of FFP support in 4 areas	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Survey of PVOs/Missions on quality of FFP support	1996	(baseline year)	71, 67, 58, 60
	1997	80% each	71, 80, 77, 53
Indicator Definition:	1998	85% each	100, 70, 100, 67
	1999	90% each	N/A – indicator dropped
Comments: This indicator was dropped from the performance monitoring plan because of difficulties in getting an adequate response rate. It will no longer be reported.	2000		
	2001		

OFFICE OF FOOD FOR PEACE

PART III. RESOURCE REQUEST

Funds available to support P.L. 480 Title II programming in FY 2000 include a total of approximately \$951million of Title II resources (including base and supplemental appropriation as well as a transfer from Title I) **(does not include \$10.0 million Farmer to Farmer)** and \$5.1 million of Development Assistance (DA) resources. These resources have been allocated between the two Office Strategic Objective (SO) Teams for further distribution to the individual activities which support each SO. To date in FY 2000, the SO#1 Team has been allocated approximately \$500 million of Title II resources to respond to emergency food aid requirements around the world. The total Title II allocation thus far in FY 2000 for the SO#2 Team was approximately \$451 million. The Administration is requesting \$837 million of Title II resources each year for both FY 2001 and FY 2002. It is anticipated that the percentage of Title II resources allocated to each of the two SO Teams during both FY 2001 and FY 2002 will remain similar to the percentage split in FY 2000.

The \$5.1 million of DA resources provided to the Office in FY 2000 continued to be pivotal to the success of all Title II activities. Approximately half of those resources were provided to our PVO/NGO Cooperating Sponsors (CSs) to assist them with training and technical assistance activities, as well as funding to complement their food aid resources and make their Title II non-emergency activities truly effective and sustainable. Such grants are used by PVOs to hire and train staff, procure equipment and supplies, provide training and technical assistance to their in-country local counterparts, as well as design, manage, monitor and evaluate their activities. The balance of the DA funds was used to provide technical assistance and institutional support to the Office in the timely and efficient management of the Title II resources.

Today, Cooperating Sponsors who have received modest additional funding, TA and training from BHR/FFP, are now expected to use their limited FFP provided dollar grants to meet an ever growing set of costly technical and programmatic requirements. These new requirements necessitate the hiring of technically trained sector, M&E, and environmental staff and consultants for PVO headquarters and/or field sites and the completion of baseline surveys, midterm and final evaluations, as well as environmental reviews. In addition, these resources are used to provide adequate TA, training and backstopping to CS field sites to ensure that activities are on track and technical concerns are being addressed. As a result of the increasing complexity of Title II activities and the continued shortage of support resources, CSs have increasingly expressed their concerns to BHR/FFP that they cannot keep doing more with less. If they are required to meet higher Title II design, approval, and performance monitoring and reporting standards, they have clearly stated that additional funding will be required.

In addition to the factors that inhibit the ability of the CSs to effectively manage and strengthen their activities, a number of factors continue to influence the ability of the Office to strengthen its internal capacities and those of its partners. In the face of

resource demands that greatly exceed the current supply, the Agency has been unable to change the relative priority placed on food security and food aid programming. Regional bureaus and Missions have not been able to increase the staff devoted to the management of the Title II activities as they continue to focus their staff resources on the management of their DA resources. In fact, indications are that critical Backstop 15 (FFPO) positions may be cut by the regional bureaus in their FY 2002 R4s. In addition, the Office's efforts to enhance its results-based management of Title II resources through the two SO Teams continues to be hampered by inadequate staff and OE resources. These constraints are compounded by the challenges of managing multiple, and often conflicting, mandates and other external influences such as the desire to rationalize the proportion of Title II resources that are monetized. Finally, efforts to coordinate Title II activities with USDA's Section 416(b) and Food for Progress activities have significantly increased workload burdens in the areas of policy dialogue, country allocation, and logistics coordination.

In response to these challenges, the Office will continue its efforts to efficiently utilize the staff and OE resources provided by the Agency. As part of this effort the Office will continue its reorganization plans in order to allocate its scarce staff resources to functions that are critically short of support. In FY 2000, the Office took several steps in the Office reorganization process by making the difficult decision to shift one staff position from a "Special Assistant" role to that of a country backstop officer (CBO) in SO#2. In addition, two clerical positions were eliminated and, in their place, two new CBO positions were added – one on each SO Team. These shifts of positions were initiated only after an extensive review of the trade-off between functions gained versus functions lost. Although the loss of the "special assistant" position and two secretarial positions would cost the Office efficiency in certain areas, the addition of three CBO slots was vital to the ability of both the SO#1 and SO#2 Teams to manage their continuously expanding portfolios.

In addition to the Office reorganization efforts, the SO#2 Team intends to begin the process of updating its Strategic Objective during FY 2001. The SO2 Team will concentrate on "getting the right food to the right people in the right place at the right time," our clear Congressional mandate. In doing so the Team will stress lifting the maximum amount of food from American farms while striving for the maximum possible food security impact of P.L. 480 funded activities. We believe that the reformulated SO will require the resource levels outlined in this request.

Resource Request for FY 2001 and FY 2002

The Office requests the following staff, OE and DA increases in order to ensure adequate financial and programmatic accountability while simultaneously supporting cooperating sponsor efforts to design and implement Title II activities that will have a demonstrable and measurable impact on food insecurity. The request level for each resource is identified for the aggregate Office level request. Disaggregate request levels are then provided for each SO Team.

A. Workforce Requirements

A.1. Direct Hire Workforce

FY 2000	27 Direct Hire Positions
FY 2001	29 Direct Hire Positions
FY 2002	29 Direct Hire Positions

In FY 2000, the SO#1 and SO#2 Teams managed approximately 124 individual activities with a total Country Backstop Officer FTE complement of 18 (12 direct hire CBOs and 6 program funded PSCs). This CBO complement represents an increase in CBO staffing over FY 1999 due to the addition of one (1) CBO slot late in the fiscal year when SO#2 gained one CBO to increase the total number of SO#2 CBOs to seven. This additional CBO position in SO#2 did not reflect the infusion of additional staff resources into BHR/FFP, but rather a reallocation of staff positions within the office. The seven CBOs in SO#2 are currently responsible for supporting 94 activities valued at more than \$400 million in Title II resources. Despite the office restructuring and the resulting addition of one additional CBO to the SO#2 team, the SO2 Team continues to face serious activity management issues that are adversely influenced by a number of factors. As an example, food security is a poorly understood, complex, multi-sectoral field that requires unique development skills. In addition, FFP does its own grant making (rather than relying on M/OP). Finally, food aid management requires unique skills in commodity procurement, transport and agricultural market analysis.

Not only is the workload to staff ratio high and the nature of the work complex, but the SO2 Team's ability to adequately manage its resources is being further jeopardized by the following:

- P.L. 480 Legislation allows Title II PVOs to work in non-USAID presence countries. These programs must be managed from Washington by the SO2 Team and currently include activities in Chad, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Mauritania. Activities in non-presence countries are also expected to increase as FFP encourages CSs to “grow” the Title II development program in sub-Saharan Africa;
- Although with reduced DA funding resources more Missions are interested in Title II, most Missions are being downsized and do not have adequate staff to backstop Title II activities. A number of Missions in food insecure countries in Africa are reluctant to consider development of new Title II activities in their countries without in-house management capacity;
- Several countries, including Angola, Rwanda, and Liberia are transitioning from emergency to non-emergency food aid programs; and
- As the new School Feeding initiative and the new LIFE Initiative continue to be operationalized, the SO2 Team's workload will increase.

To adequately address the critical problems addressed above and for SO#2 to effectively manage its Title II resources and achieve the results while modifying its Strategic Plan, the Team clearly needs an increased number of direct hire staff.

Therefore, the SO#2 Team is requesting two new project officers to work full time on SO#2. As currently envisioned, the two new full time project officers needed are:

- (1) A country backstop officer to assume responsibility for activities in West Africa.
- (2) A country backstop officer to assume responsibility for activities in up to three countries, as well as serve as the Office's technical assistance and training coordinator. The latter will serve as a liaison with the technical offices in the Global Bureau (Health/Nutrition and Ag/Food Security) whose contracts SO#2 plans to buy into for technical support. This person should also have expertise in food security technical areas, which will continue as a critical focus of the SO#2 Team's institutional strengthening support.

In addition to the additional staffing requirements for SO#2, the SO#1 Team also has additional staffing requirements that are necessary for the effective management of its program resources. In particular, SO#1 continues to be vulnerable to staff shortages when responding to even one major food emergency. Past experience with the responses in Central America (Hurricane Mitch), Kosovo, and East Timor has clearly demonstrated that as much as 50 percent of the SO#1 staff must be diverted from ongoing emergency program backstopping for adequate management of a complex food emergency. In FY 2000, the staff drain associated with the massive food emergency in the Horn of Africa has again stressed the SO#1 management capabilities to the limit. Four additional positions have been identified as critical to give the SO#1 Team the ability to effectively respond to more than one major food emergency at one time:

- 1) Two (2) new CBO position to assume country specific activity responsibilities. These positions would reduce the number of countries and activities that each CBO must manage. In addition, it would provide more flexibility for CBOs to TDY, participate on DART Teams, and provide support to the Bureau Ops center.
- 2) One (1) POD Emergency Response Specialist to backstop emergency freight accounts, ITSH pipelines, and associated NMS actions.
- 3) One (1) Information Officer for the management of Title II information and correspondence requirements. In particular during major emergency food aid activities, the effective management of information can be critical to the Office, Bureau, and Agency.

The Office is formally requesting direct hire slots for just two (2) of the six (6) additional positions described above. The four (4) remaining positions are being requested through other hiring mechanisms described below. If the Agency is unable to provide even the two (2) additional direct hire slots through increased direct hire FTEs, it is strongly requested that alternative options be authorized for those positions as well. Options to consider include NEP, PMIs, AAAS Fellows, expanded institutional contractor support (including computer access and co-location in the RRB), and/or PSCs, with a requisite level of funding. In addition, a number of key Congressional offices have acknowledged that additional staffing resources are needed for BHR/FFP to increase the timely and effective programming of Title II resources. BHR senior management could also discuss with USAID's Legislative office the viability of adding

language to the P.L.480 appropriation that would provide the authority to use a modest amount of Title II funding for administrative purposes.

A.2. Program Funded Workforce

FY 2000 6 OFDA funded SO#1 PSCs
Total 6 PSCs

FY 2001 6 OFDA funded SO#1 PSCs plus
4 Title II funded SO#1 PSCs
3 Title II funded SO#2 PSCs
Total 13 PSCs

FY 2002 3 OFDA funded SO#1 PSCs plus
7 Title II funded SO#1 PSCs
3 Title II funded SO#2 PSCs
Total 13 PSCs

As mentioned in the discussion of Direct Hire Workforce levels, Congressional staffers have identified legislative authorities currently available to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) that provide resources for the USDA's administration of the Title I program. If similar authorities were made available to USAID for the administration of Title II resources, then USAID would have the capability of hiring personal services contractors (PSC) to support both the SO#1 and SO#2 teams. If this new legislative authority is granted, the Office is requesting approval to hire seven (7) new Title II funded PSCs in FY 2001 and ten (10) new PSCs in FY 2002. By phasing in the hiring of Title II funded PSCs, the Office would be both verifying the permanence of the new authorities and allowing a rational phase-out of the IDA/OFDA funded PSC contracts.

Both the SO#1 and SO#2 Teams are in critical need of these additional PSC resources for a number of reasons. In addition to the justification provided for the additional direct hire slots requested, there is little argument from our Title II partners that both of the SO Teams are severely understaffed to manage the resource levels in their respective portfolios. In managing any major food emergency, the SO#1 team is currently forced to focus its limited staff on the management of the emergency at hand. Multiple team members working on one emergency plus the allocation of staff for temporary duties overseas often leaves other Title II emergency actions under managed. In addition, the effectiveness of both SO Teams is hampered by a lack of qualified technical experts on the staff. The authority to hire PSC technical experts would enable both teams to substantially strengthen their management capabilities.

B. Operating Expense (Non-Personnel) Requirements

In addition to the workforce requirements described above, both SO Teams request increases in the level of OE funds for travel and support services. Late in FY 2000, SO#1 will be filling three direct hire vacancies that will add to the Team requirements for travel resources. Additional travel funds will be needed by the SO#2 Team for increased CBO travel in support of: a) increased numbers of activities in non-presence countries and those with limited Mission capacity; b) the evaluation of mission's food security strategy revisions and new activity designs; and c) several programs transitioning from emergency to development food aid.

Budget Table 1: Operating Expense Requirements
(Thousands of Dollars)

Operating Expense	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Request	FY 2002 Request
Travel			
1. Travel for site visits, reviews and evaluations	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
Travel to conferences and BHR/FFP field workshops	\$ 60.00	\$204.00	\$204.00
Travel Subtotal:	\$160.00	\$404.00	\$404.00
Services			
3.a Management & Professional Services	\$ 16.00	\$ 36.00	\$ 36.00
3.b Supplies and Services	\$ 6.00	\$ 26.50	\$ 26.50
Services Subtotal:	\$ 22.00	\$ 62.50	\$ 62.50
TOTAL NON-PERSONNEL OPERATIONAL EXPENSE BUDGET:	\$182.00	\$466.50	\$466.50

Specifically, the line items in Budget Table 1 would be used for:

- (1) Travel for site visits, to participate in DAP and PAA reviews, to provide technical assistance to Missions and CS partners, and to backstop activities in “non-presence” countries. Additionally, because many Title II activities are due for mid-term and final evaluations in the next few years; therefore, increased travel funds are needed in FY 2001 and FY 2002 to allow adequate FFP participation on the evaluation teams. This is critical for assessing the effectiveness and impact of Title II activities, and for determining the influence of monitoring for results on FFP's development programs;
- (2) Travel to international conferences and workshops to: (a) increase coordination with other donors, and (b) conduct two food aid manager training workshops one in Washington and one in the field; and

- (3) Management supplies and services for computer hardware and software – this is critical for maintaining FFP’s information system for tracking P.L. 480 commodities, since it is separate from the Agency’s computer system and support, and not part of the New Management System (NMS).

C. Development Assistance (DA) Resource Requirements

The Office of Food for Peace received \$5.1 million of DA resources to support an \$961 million food aid budget for FY 2000. This very modest amount of DA resources has proven insufficient to support the design and implementation of Title II activities associated with such a large amount of program resources and cannot be expected to effectively promote efficient management of the program resources and demonstrable results. Although some progress has been made in strengthening the review, approval and design of developmental food aid programs, much more needs to be done, as described in the following sections.

Overview of DA-Supported Activities:

**Budget Table 2: Office Development Assistance Requirements
(Thousands of Dollars)**

Development Assistance Type	Actual FY 2000	Request FY 2001	Request FY 2002
1. FFP Institutional & Administrative Support Contract	\$1,501.00	\$2,711.00	\$2,711.00
2. Institutional Support Agreements	\$2,363.00	\$4,329.00	\$4,329.00
3. Technical Assistance and Training	\$1,088.00	\$ 650.00	\$ 650.00
4. Child Survival Fellow	\$ 148.00	\$ 190.00	\$ 190.00
5. Other	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	\$5,100.00	\$7,880.00	\$7,880.00

**Budget Table 2a: SO#1 Development Assistance Requirements
(Thousands of Dollars)**

Development Assistance Type	Actual FY 2000	Request FY 2001	Request FY 2002
1. FFP Institutional & Administrative Support Contract	\$ 470.00	\$1,211.00	\$1,211.00
2. Institutional Support Agreements	\$ 869.00	\$ 819.00	\$ 769.00
3. Technical Assistance and Training	\$ 150.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 250.00
4. Child Survival Fellow	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00
5. Other	\$ 0.00		

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	\$1,519.00	\$2,260.00	\$2,260.00
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Budget Table 2b: SO#2 Development Assistance Requirements
(Thousands of Dollars)**

Development Assistance Type	Actual FY 2000	Request FY 2001	Request FY 2002
1. FFP Institutional & Administrative Support Contract	\$1,031.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
2. Institutional Support Agreements	\$1,494.00	\$3,460.00	\$3,460.00
3. Technical Assistance and Training	\$ 938.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00
4. Child Survival Fellow	\$ 118.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 160.00
5. Other	\$ 0.00		
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	\$3,581.00	\$5,620.00	\$5,620.00

(1) FFP Institutional Support Contract: \$2,711,000

Technical support to both SO Teams is currently provided through a contract with Mendez England & Associates. This support contract is due to expire during the late Spring of FY 2001. BHR/FFP is in the process of drafting a new scope of work for the follow-on contract that will respond to some of the weaknesses identified in the current contract scope. In particular, SO#2 has identified the need for two new senior analyst positions to provide higher level technical and programmatic guidance to the SO#2 CBOs. In general, the institutional support contract remains a critical component for BHR/FFP by assisting in a number of administrative and information services. These services include commodity and logistics tracking, information system management, assistance in administering grant programs and organizing program reviews, and organization of conferences and training workshops such as the Food Aid Managers Course offered annually for USAID Washington and field staff.

(2) Institutional Support Assistance (ISAs): \$4,229,000

Institutional Support Assistance (previously called Institutional Support Grants) are a key resource for providing our implementing partners with the necessary dollar resources to achieve the following:

- a) Strengthen CS headquarters and/or regional level institutional and technical capacity to design and manage technically sound and appropriate food security interventions; to manage for results; to account for Title II commodities; and to better design, target and manage food aid activities. This includes building the capacity of PVOs to: develop monitoring and evaluation systems; conduct Bellmon analyses and manage commodity monetization activities; design technically appropriate and sound sector activities that have a demonstrable impact on enhanced food security; and adapt and test methodologies or tools to transition from emergency to development programs.
- b) Improve collaboration amongst CSs implementing Title II activities, and between CSs and Missions doing integrated programming in specific countries. This includes

encouraging CS partners to jointly develop or improve tools, methodologies, expertise and monitoring and evaluation systems; fostering collaboration and joint planning between CSs and Missions, international organizations and other donors, including integration of non-food resources; and encouraging mentoring of smaller CSs by larger, more experienced organizations;

- c) Conduct needs assessments and design programs in new countries or regions where CS is not currently implementing activities, particularly South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa; and develop innovative approaches to initiate new activities in least developed (LDC) and low-income, food deficit countries (LIFDCs); and
- d) Support a food aid coordinating/collaborative body representing the Title II Cooperating Sponsors.

Current Funding of ISAs

During FY 2000, BHR/FFP is utilizing approximately \$2.4 million of its DA allocation to support the ISAs for all Title II CSs, supporting development and emergency programming. Of that amount, the SO#2 Team is providing approximately \$1.5 million toward ISA support. Because the overall level of DA available to BHR/FFP is inadequate to meet office requirements, FFP is using approximately \$2.6 million of its P.L. 480 Title II Section 202(e) funds to support ISA cooperative agreements, bringing the Office funding total to \$5 million. FFP awarded 14 multi-year cooperative agreements late in FY 1998 and is seeking full DA funding in both FY 2001 and 2002 for the \$4.3 million mortgage. SO#2 is expecting to provide \$4,000,000 out of its DA allocation in both of those years.

It is also important to note that USAID's PVO partners contend that the limited availability of ISA resources will hamper their ability to design new food aid development activities, since design of new initiatives requires an extensive investment of staff time, travel funds and technical analyses that are critical to assess a host country's food security problems and propose appropriate interventions to address them.

(3) Technical Assistance and Training and JHU Fellow: \$940,000

FFP's surveys of Missions and CSs technical assistance needs identified a broad range of support requirements.

- a) CSs are in need of support in problem analysis, program design and strategic planning, particularly as it relates to the unique, cross sector nature of food security programming. Such expertise needs to be built up at CS headquarters and field offices.
- b) CSs are seeking concrete guidance and access to tested models on many food aid specific activities, including commodity and ration selection, Bellmon determinations, monetization best practices, weaning foods and beneficiary targeting. Operations research will need to be carried out to develop models and protocols in some of these areas.

- c) Missions are interested in accessing support in food security strategic planning and program integration, in seeing a more formal structure to food security/food aid programming; and in seeing greater synergy between programs in health, nutrition, agriculture and income generation – all sector programs that affect food security.
- d) BHR/FFP, Missions and CSs require ongoing access to expertise in monitoring and evaluation (M&E), including a review of the relevance and application of food security monitoring and impact indicators developed this far, an assessment of existing M&E tools that are easy to use in PVO-type programs, field testing of the indicator guides developed under the **G/HN Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance** (FANta) Project, and examination of appropriate qualitative indicators for food security programs. Additionally, there is further work required on development of indicators in Natural Resources Management (NRM), Micro-enterprise, Education and institutional strengthening.
- e) BHR/FFP needs greater access to technical expertise in the review of CS proposals, Results Reports, Bellmon Analyses and Monetization plans, as well as Mission strategic plan and R4s, and other required documents. Although technical support is sometimes available within the Agency for Title II proposal reviews, Agency participation in our review processes is irregular.
- f) BHR/FFP requires greater assistance in: (1) improving linkages between relief and development; and (2) developing long-term strategies (internally and with other donors) for food security programming in critical regions, such as the Greater Horn of Africa and the Sahel.

In order to address the broad technical assistance and training needs described above, FFP proposes to access assistance through the following Global Bureau contract mechanisms in FY 2001, with the levels proposed:

a) Project: \$540,000

In recent years the SO2 Team has been accessing a modest level of technical assistance from the Global Bureau's Office of Health and Nutrition, currently through the Food and Nutrition SO2 FY 2002 Request for FANTA Technical Assistance (FANTA) project. FANTA activities support both SO1 and SO2 within FFP, providing technical assistance to FFP, Field Missions and Cooperating Sponsors. FANTA activities have been divided into three separate intermediate results (IR) designed to correspond to the FFP strategic plan. FANTA's Strategic Objective is **improved food and nutrition policy, strategy, and program development**.

FANTA will be operating under obligations from FY 2000 where a total of \$988,000 of DA resources is being provided by the Office. This amount is approximately 30 percent greater than the amount provided in FY 1999 due to a one-time increase in funding from the SO2 Team. As discussed under the section describing Office workforce requirements, the SO2 Team has identified an increasing need for technical guidance in many of the sectoral areas targeted with Title II resources. In addition to the sectoral support, FANTA also has provided support to both SO Teams through: training sessions at the annual Food Aid Manager's course; provision of issues papers related to both SO1

and SO2 PVO proposals; review of FFP documents such as the 1999 U.S. International Food Assistance Report; review of proposals for the food fortification workshop and the ACC/SCN; assistance with the development of the FFP/ER R4; and the provision of technical support to USAID/Luanda in results reporting for SO1 programs.

The FANTA program proposes a significant level of support to FFP's SO1 and SO2 Teams over the next five years. The following activities were put forward in the FANTA workplan for FY 1999 and are illustrative of the range of support envisioned for FY 2000, FY 2001, and beyond.

- a) **Core support to SO1 and SO2.** The core activities include, but are not limited to: provision of assistance to FFP, Cooperating Sponsors (CSs), and field Missions in designing, implementing, and evaluating Title II activities. This support consists of technical reviews of all new DAPs, DAP Amendments and Annual Results Reports, technical review of ISA annual plans and M&E systems, collection of information and analysis for the SO1 and SO2 Results Reports, designing and participating in monitoring and evaluation regional workshops for CSs, and research and analysis leading to draft policy papers for FFP consideration.
 - b) **Development of access indicator for SO2.** Over the past several years, CSs have requested assistance in the development of easily collectable indicators of access to food, to replace more costly consumption data. FANTA subcontractors Cornell and Tufts Universities will validate the USDA domestic food security survey instrument for developing country situations in up to three countries, two of which will be partially funded by FFP. Tom Marchione in PPE will be the BHR point person with FANTA for this effort.
 - c) **Development of food ration guide.** FANTA has reviewed best practices in the implementation of supplementary feeding programs in the literature and in two South American Title II programs. The program recommendations that have resulted show promise for improving food security impact. The recommendations need to be tested in other regions and validated prior to the issuance of a best practice food ration guide. Assistance will consist of extensive consultation and workshops in up to 3 countries, in addition to close monitoring of nutrition impact in programs that adopt the recommendations.
 - d) **Assessment of the impact of Title II programs and lessons learned.** Five years into the implementation of the Agency's Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper and with an anticipated turnover of a third of the ongoing DAPs in the coming year, the time is opportune to examine our accomplishments and validate the continued relevance of the Policy Paper. The assessment would look at achievements by sector, and explore the endogenous and exogenous factors which have influenced outcomes through an extensive review of results reports and evaluations, and the development of case studies, culminating in a high-level review meeting designed to raise the profile of this important resource.
- b) **SO2 FY 2002 Request for G/EGAD Food Security II Cooperative Agreement with Michigan State University: \$110,000**

Under its Cooperative Agreement with USAID, Michigan State University (MSU)'s Department of Agricultural Economics, has continued to strengthen the capacities of USAID missions, host country governments, and participating eligible Title II organizations, to factor the economics of food production and marketing into interventions designed to promote food security. Areas of geographic concentration continue to be the Horn, Sahel, and vulnerable regions of Southern Africa.

MSU will be operating under obligations from FY 2000 where a total of \$110,000 of DA resources are being provided by the Office. These funds have allowed USAID Missions, BHR/FFP, and Cooperating Sponsors (CS) to address key food aid policy and procedural questions on a sound, empirical basis. The key questions have included:

- how food aid programs facilitate the transition from relief and development;
- how improved targeting of food aid reaches the most chronically food-insecure populations in selected sub-Saharan countries and regions;
- what the proper role of food aid is and what its impact is on food markets;
- what the most cost-effective approaches are to food aid monetization;
- what the role of food aid is in promoting agricultural input intensification;
- how strengthening food aid "complementarity" between health, nutrition, demography and agricultural transformation is achieved; and
- how CSs participate in decentralized agricultural marketing information systems.

MSU will build on the above research findings and networks in sub-Saharan Africa to undertake impact studies of Title II food aid monetization activities, over a period of 15 months. The impact studies will be conducted in three countries, Mozambique, Rwanda and Uganda, subject to confirmation and prior concurrence of USAID Missions in those countries. One interim report and a summary of preliminary findings that will guide the longer analytical effort, will be provided after approximately 3 months.

MSU will also be working in collaboration with FANTA to develop access indicators. MSU's work in the development of economic indicators as proxy for nutritional indicators will support and compliment the FANTA activities. These activities have already begun through work in Mozambique and are being further tested in Kenya. In addition to these sites MSU will test this model in the two to three sites as the FANTA access indicator field activities.

In addition, research papers are to be delivered on monetization and regional markets, explaining opportunities for private sector involvement in the West and Coastal African regional monetization, and analyzing food aid impacts on local food grain marketing. The transfer of skills to USAID and CS field staff takes place through in-country and regional workshops and training events related to the design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of Title II activities.

c) SO2 FY 2002 Request for G/HN Johns Hopkins University Health and Child Survival Fellow: \$190,000

The Office's health and nutrition technical support is through the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) Health and Child Survival Fellowship program, using DA funding. Given that the SO2 Team allocates half of its budget to support programs in maternal and child health and nutrition and water and sanitation, the addition of a full time JHU fellow in FY 2000 has been invaluable. Continuation of funding for a JHU fellow is essential. If insufficient DA is provided for this purpose, USDH levels and other alternatives should be re-evaluated.

Information Annex: Updated Results Framework

Goal: Improved household nutrition and agricultural productivity among targeted vulnerable groups.

Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity

SSO2 Indicators:

- 2.1 Percentage of new approved DAPs that identify objectively measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance.
- 2.2 Percentage of partner's activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively measurable indicators within first year of implementation.
- 2.3 Percentage of partner's annual targets demonstrated to be achieved, based on objectively measured indicators.

Intermediate Result 2.1:

Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support programs.

IR 2.1. Indicators:

- a. Percentage of DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better.
- b. Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for redelegating Title II program authority.

Intermediate Result 2.2:

Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies.

IR 2.2. Indicators:

- a. Number of countries in which 2 or more PVOs have joint or coordinated M&E activities.
- b. Number of countries in which joint US-EU food security strategies are developed.
- c. Number of countries in which PVOs and WFP develop joint food security strategies.

Title II programs are making peoples lives better

Agricultural Productivity

Agricultural productivity and incomes improve in Mozambique

CARE's Viable Initiative for the Development of Agriculture (VIDA) in the Mozambican province of Nampula provides support for a variety of agricultural activities among small-holders in 11 districts, with the overall goal of improving food security for 45,000 vulnerable rural households. Mid-term survey results provide a picture of the depth and breath of CARE's support to participating communities and households. The range and consistency of differences between CARE and non-CARE household provide a very plausible argument for project impact, even at mid-term.

CARE has introduced new varieties of sunflower, sesame, maize, pigeon pea and groundnut that have been adopted by over 40,000 farmers in Nampula and Zambezia provinces. Yields have risen dramatically, and marketing has been greatly enhanced thought a combination of improved storage capabilities and improved linkages between farmers and traders. The establishment of farmers' associations provided with market information and training in negotiation skills, has facilitated large expansion in marketed produce and has given confidence to both men and women in rural communities. Annual income levels in households directly assisted by CARE (of whom 30% are headed by women) have risen 46% in the 3 years since the project began. There has also been trickle-down of benefits to other households in CARE project areas although CARE has had no direct input into the households.

(CARE Mozambique Viable Initiative for the Development of Agriculture (VIDA) mid-term survey report, Mary Arimond, Oct. 1999.)

Rural households in Food for the Hungry Mozambique's program areas have seen a dramatic increase in their food security. When the program started, households could only produce enough staples to cover consumption needs for 8 months. Increased maize production and improved storage capacity have contributed to household grain supplies now being sufficient for an average of 13.1 months worth of consumption.

(Food for the Hungry Mozambique FY 1999 Results Report)

More efficient water use helps poor farmers in Eritrea

Since 1994, Africare has been implementing the Bada Irrigated Agriculture Project in Eritrea, which includes the construction of a water diversion structure to control the

amount of water to farmers' fields, in order to maximize the efficiency water use for crop production.

By 1999, the average yield of indigenous sorghum planted by Bada farmers in the program area had increased by 41%, and average yield of an improved variety disseminated under the program had increased by 120%. One farmer, who adopted all of the recommended production techniques, obtained 60 quintals/hectare (compared with the average of 22), a phenomenal accomplishment that increases the likelihood that other farmers will adopt the recommended production technique package.

(Africare Eritrea FY 1999 Results Report)

Improved watershed management results in a wide range of benefits for Bihar tribals in India

In tribal villages in south central Bihar, CRS has been transitioning to a watershed-based approach to land management since 1997. Working with a local NGO, Amlagora Seva Foundation (ASF), demonstration plots were set up, small water cisterns and small earth works were constructed to arrest the flow of rainwater, thereby adding soil moisture and reducing erosion. With time, the scope of land management has been expanded to include storm water retention tanks, nursery preparation and tree plantation activities which has led to area-based erosion control, water harvesting, and land management activities along with community organization.

As a result of the ASF-CRS program, the growing season has been extended and the area under cultivation has increased. Farming during the dry season has become possible. High yielding varieties are increasing being adopted. Tree cropping is common. Off-farm income generation opportunities are increasing, helping to check migration. Families now dream of building brick houses with tin roofs to replace mud homes, and are able to avoid recurring to moneylenders. Amongst the nonagricultural spin off benefits, two young women have started night schools for herd boys, girls and adult women.

(CRS India FY 1999 Results Report)

Improved management of natural resources helps increase access to water in arid areas of Ethiopia

CRS Ethiopia's Natural Resource Management (NRM) activities focus primarily on reclaiming degraded areas (hillsides and gullies) through structural and vegetative conservation measures. Evidence in several communities is already indicating how these successful interventions are improving the quality of life of the inhabitants. In one case, the watershed area of Dire Dawa region, increased vegetative growth on previously barren hillsides appears to have contributed to an accelerated recharging of underground

aquifers, which in turn has resulted in the rehabilitation of at least one shallow well that had been dry for several years.

Given proper management, reclamation measures lead to consistent reductions in soil loss. This is attributable to the aggregated effects of increased vegetation cover resulting from revegetation activities, closure of hillsides from interference by humans and livestock, and the establishment of soil conservation structure which reduced the rate of erosion from surface run-off and facilitated its infiltration into the soil profile.

(CRS Ethiopia FY 1999 Results Report)

Kenyan farmer and mother benefits from improved irrigation

World Vision Kenya's Morulem Irrigation Scheme (MIS) Project has contributed to improved food security for 1,228 farm families, and helped increase their ability to withstand the effects of poor rains. For example, during the recent drought in the country, farmers participating in the MIS project had enough food for their own consumption, while a few even had extra for sale. Adou Lokorikeju, a mother of five and one of the successful farmers in MIS, produced enough to sell part of her production to purchase iron to improve the construction of her two-bedroom house. She also purchased 15 goats as an investment, and still had enough to feed her family.

(World Vision Kenya FY 1999 Results Report)

Food security of both rural and urban poor improved in Cape Verde

The Cape Verde rural associations movement continues to grow and attract interest among Government of Cape Verde policymakers and other donors as a vehicle of rural entrepreneurial development and a force for improvement in food security. Rural households who participate in associations working with the Title II-funded ACDI/VOCA program have seen their incomes increase by 71% since the project began in FY 1997. In female-headed households (FHH), the increase has been even greater; FHH working for the associations have seen their per capita incomes increase by 94%.

Due to ACDI/VOCA's efforts to promote drip irrigation, vegetable production is increasing rapidly and the extremely high prices in the market are moderating. This allows more of the poor to afford vegetables, thus improving their diet. The credit program for drip irrigation will continue after the ACDI/VOCA program finishes, because it is being taken over by a start-up rural credit association and a commercial bank.

(ACDI/VOCA Cape Verde FY99 Results Report)

Sustainable rural enterprises create jobs and reduce rural poverty in Ghana

Technoserve (TNS) Ghana's 5 year DAP aims to improve agricultural productivity in Ghana through the development of sustainable rural enterprises. During FY 1999, TNS provided direct technical support to 276 local businesses and community-based enterprises – reducing rural poverty by increasing the incomes of over 124,313 people (approximately 48% of whom were women.) Since 1996, TNS-assisted enterprises have helped increased rural employment by 13,040 jobs.

(Technoserve Ghana FY 1999 Results Report)

Honduran farmers produce a timely surplus in the aftermath of Mitch

Yields of basic grains produced by farmers in areas where CARE Honduras' Title II-funded EXTENSA program operates have increased by 22.5% over the past 2 years. Many farmers in the project area now produce a marketable surplus, with the corresponding increase in their household incomes. In the aftermath of hurricane Mitch, many of the impoverished municipalities where EXTENSA operates were able to provide basic grains to those areas devastated by the flooding.

(CARE Honduras FY 1999 Results Report)

Title II-funded program collaboration with an International Agricultural Research Center improves crop production in India

The International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs) carry out programs in basic research that have identified many high potential crop varieties and agricultural production techniques. However, getting these research results out to the farmers has been difficult, due to a lack of in-field presence by the IARCs. Collaboration between IARCs and Title II community-based programs presents an important opportunity to disseminate these important research findings.

In India, Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and the International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) have initiated an on-farm research-cum-demonstration in a local farmer's fields with legume crops as a second crop during the rice fallow period. In CRS project sites in Madhya Pradesh, farmers have traditionally grown one crop of rice during the rainy season. Migration in search of work in the off-season was common. The CRS/ICRISAT demonstration, regular field visits by ICRISAT scientists and CRS staff, and support from local NGOs has helped generate interest among 30 farmers from different land situations in growing legumes. The introduction of legume production has improved food security in many ways, through increased protein in the diets, improved soil fertility, and increased animal feed and fuel. Seeing the success achieved by the initial farmers, many farmers have come forward to participate in the program.

(CRS India FY 1999 Results Report)

Household nutrition

Increased production, improved storage and better diets lead to healthier and better nourished Ghanaian children

The overall goal of ADRA Ghana's 5 year DAP is to improve food security among over 16,000 subsistence farmers and their more than 116,000 dependents living in rural areas of Ghana. The agroforestry component of the project enhances food availability and access while the water, sanitation and nutrition components address food utilization and health. Since 1997, the program area has seen marked enhancement in agricultural productivity, appreciable increases in the income levels of client farmer households, improved nutritional and health status of mothers and children, and the creation of more than 39,5000 paid full- and part-time jobs.

One strategy for increasing the availability of food is to diminish losses of production that occur during storage. ADRA helps farmers construct new and improved storage units that have helped reduce storage losses from 22% to 5% in 3 years.

The fruit and nut trees planted under the agroforestry component provide food and income to the households. The income generated can have long-term benefits for increased food security. For example, as Iddrisu Gbande, a farmer in the Bring-Ahafo region, put it, "For the first time in my life I have earned an income from a tree. The income came at the appropriate time because it enabled me to pay my children's school fees on time. For once they were not sent home for school fees."

Crop diversification and nutrition education have helped improve not only the quantity but, importantly, the quality of diets. High protein legumes such as soy beans, locust beans and cow peas have been incorporated into family meals. Since 1996, the percent of households with daily consumption of fruit has increased by 280%, of protein rich foods by 103% and of vitamin A rich foods by 37%.

When ADRA commenced their current activities in 1997, 30% of children in program communities suffered from diarrhea episodes. Due to increased availability of potable water through wells, and regular nutrition, water and sanitation education sessions, by 1999, the incidence of this water borne disease had decreased to 5%.

As a result of this Title II-funded multi-sectoral, integrated food security program., the percent of children under 3 with normal weight-for-age has increased from 20% at baseline in 1996 to 77% in 1999.

(ADRA Ghana FY 1999 Results Report)

Severely malnourished children in Peru regain good nutritional status

Over two thirds of the severely malnourished children who participated in ADRA/Peru's Infant Nutrition program during FY 1999 regained normal nutritional status. This is attributable to a well organized and timely distribution of food rations, well trained and motivated health promoters, and very good collaboration with the Ministry of Health. (USAID/Lima cabled comments on ADRA FY99 Results Report.)

Ethiopian children and their mothers are healthier and better nourished

During FY 1999, maternal and child health and nutrition and water and sanitation-related activities showed impressive results in CRS Ethiopia target areas, particularly in the East Shewa zone, where the former center-based projects have been phased out, and the community-based activities have been phased in over the past 3 areas. The project has contributed to reducing the rates of malnutrition among children under 2 years old. Over 94% of children registered in the target areas regularly had their growth monitored. These and similar project activities (Title II supplementary food rations targeted to children under 24 months, appropriate health education, improved access to potable water, and timely follow-up by health animators of malnourished children) helped reduce the percentage of children below 80% of normal weight for age from a baseline of 50% to 35%. Far fewer children in target sites were severely malnourished (down to 1.8% from a baseline of 5.4%.).

In a marked improvement from a baseline number of 41.7%, 75.7% of children between 12-23 months are fully immunized in CRS project areas. Another notable achievement concerns the percentage of mothers reporting that they had received one or more antenatal visits, which has increased significantly to 54% from a baseline of 32%.

(CRS Ethiopia FY 1999 Results Report)

Integrated program results in decreased malnutrition and improved health for women and children in Bolivia

Food for the Hungry International's (FHI) program in Bolivia increases food security in remote altiplano (highland) and valley communities by combining agricultural productivity, community water and sanitation, maternal-child health and nutrition, and food for education development program in an integrated manner. Significant positive impact has been demonstrated on local and household food security for 66,232 families during 1999.

The prevalence of chronic malnutrition decreased from 53% to 33% in children 24-59 months in the three years since the project started. The prevalence of acute diarrhea in children under 2 decreased from 34% at baseline to 6% in 1999, an improvement of

183%, due in part to an increase in the percent of the target population with access to safe water from 34% in 1996 to 55% in 1999.

Coverage of prenatal care for pregnant women has also increased noticeably in FHI's project areas. Only 18% of pregnant women had at least one early prenatal visit (before the 5th month of their pregnancy) when the project started. In 1996. By 1999, 64% of all pregnant women had at least one early prenatal visit.

(FHI Bolivia FY 99 Results Report)

Healthy pregnancies, healthy babies for women in India

Increased coverage of iron/folate supplementation helps address the serious problem of anemia among pregnant Indian women. Since 1997, CRS India has increased the percent of pregnant women in program areas who received adequate supplementation with iron/folate tablets from 24% to 85%.

(CRS India FY 1999 Results Report)

Maternal health programs address cultural constraint to improved women's health in Ghana

CRS Ghana's health campaigns have contributed to awareness of negative and harmful cultural practices that hinder child survival and development. For instance, pregnant women in the East-Mamprusi district used to report for antenatal care only after the custom of 'plisibu'. 'Plisibu' says that women are not allowed to talk of the pregnancy or indicate to anyone in anyway that they are pregnant until about the fourth month when they begin to show. There is then a ceremony when they are sprinkled with ash. Only after this ceremony occurs may a woman appear in public and talk about the pregnancy. Through education and community sensitization, this practice is gradually giving way to early attendance at prenatal clinics and other improved practices that will help lead to healthier pregnancies and healthier births.

(CRS Ghana FY 1999 Results Report)

Ensuring the future sustainability of maternal and child health and nutrition programs in Peru

The Title II program in Peru is in the process of passing responsibility for the maternal and child health and nutrition program to the Government of Peru (GOP), with the aim of achieving total sustainability. ADRA, in its Infant Nutrition Program has successfully incorporated 700 of its trained health promoters into the Ministry of Health's network of community promoters. These experienced health promoters will continue their work

under the Ministry's supervision after the termination of ADRA's activities in the targeted communities.

(USAID/Lima FY 1999 Results Report)

Basic Education

Haiti's most vulnerable children are getting a better education

CRS Haiti is using the Title II food as a leverage to improve the quality of education offered in schools participating in their Food for Education program, in order to ensure that Haiti's most vulnerable children are receiving a quality education. All schools entering the program must now meet a minimum set of criteria which include student-teacher ratio and education level of teachers. Also, in order to focus the resources on the most vulnerable, all new schools must be located in priority, or the most food insecure, zones.

CRS Haiti supports the creation of PTAs, and works closely with them. During FY 1999, twenty projects were carried out entirely by PTAs that, once sensitized by CRS education staff on the importance of community participation, took the initiative themselves to respond to a need at their school. This is an encouraging trend that demonstrates a willingness and capacity of communities to independently become involved in improving the education of their children. It is responses such as these that show the most promise of sustainability.

(CRS Haiti FY 1999 Results Report)

Title II food helps girls stay in school in Ghana

CRS Ghana uses Title II food rations in its Food for Education (FFE) program to encourage families to keep girls in school. A monthly ration is provided to the family if the girl student maintains a 85% attendance rate. During FY 1999, approximately two thirds of the girls enrolled in the take-home ration program attended school 85% or more school days a month, exceeding program targets by 37%. Over the past 2 years, CRS has taken a number of measures to increase the effectiveness of the take-home ration program, including intensive community mobilization regarding the importance of girls education, and more vigilant monitoring of ration distribution to ensure the attendance criteria were being met before a family got a ration.

(CRS Ghana FY 1999 Results Report)

Better micronutrient status and improved health help improve learning in Burkina Faso

CRS implements a Food for Education program that provides school lunches to approximately 370,000 students in rural primary schools in Burkina Faso. The school lunches form part of a multi-faceted program aimed at increasing the quality of education in Burkinabe schools, and the ability of children to take advantage of these improved educational opportunities. During FY 1999, CRS successfully collaborated with the Ministry of Basic Education and Literacy (MEBE) to distribute micro-nutrients (iodine and vitamin A) and de-worming medication in the schools. The World Bank also collaborated through the provision of more than \$150,000 in support of the micronutrient distribution. In addition, a health and nutrition guide was developed in collaboration with the Association of Provincial Directors of Education, and education seminars were organized to instruct teachers on its proper use. CSR/BF also organized an education campaign on micronutrient deficiencies, hygiene and water-borne diseases for the benefit of teachers and PTAs.

(CRS Burkina Faso FY 1999 Results Report)

Learning new learning methods helps Indian teachers teach better

In Uttar Pradesh, an assessment of CRS teacher training highlighted areas where the training seems to be working, and identified areas for improvement. Findings from assessments in 13 randomly chosen classrooms show that 77% of ECDC teachers follow daily lesson plans while 69% use some interactive games to teach concepts. At the primary level, 88% of classroom teachers observed used stories, role-play and games to explain lessons and motivate children to participate. On the other hand only 44% of teachers make use of locally available materials for classroom work, and only 22% provide opportunities for creative classroom activities. These findings will be used in planning follow up teacher training.

(CRS India FY 1999 Results Report)

General Relief

Non-emergency programs are there for vulnerable groups

CRS India's Title II development program contains a General Relief (GR) component designed to increase food access by destitute and other vulnerable groups, and to provide an emergency response capability. During FY 1999, GR rations were provided to 97,276 persons, including orphaned children and infants, the destitute, homeless, disabled, sick and dying. An additional 215,164 victims of 20 separate emergencies, largely caused by cyclones and floods, received Title II assistance, usually for a period of 10-15 days.

(CRS India FY 1999 Results Report)

In FY 1998, CRS Ghana responded to an appeal from the two northern most regions of Ghana to provide relief assistance to victims of a drought that hit that part of the country during the preceding cropping season. The effects of that drought extended into FY 1999, largely due to the crop failure during the 1998 cropping season. To mitigate the effects of this, CRS Ghana supported an extended intervention for drought victims, which provided food assistance to 45,000 of the most vulnerable community members in the Upper East Region.

(CRS Ghana FY 1999 Results Report)

5/24

Appendix Table 1. FY 2000 Title II Non-Emergency Programs

Country/Sponsor	Commodities		202(e) (\$'000)	% value by technical component					
	MT's	Value ('000\$)		HN	WS	AG	ED	ME#	HA
<u>AFRICA</u>									
Angola	34,700	\$7,983	\$0						
CARE**	9,080	\$2,086	\$0			100			
CRS**	1,560	\$400	\$0			100			
SCF**	8,040	\$1,854	\$0			100			
WV**	16,020	\$3,643	\$0			100			
Benin	5,840	3,588	\$0						
CRS	5,840	\$3,588.2	\$0	82			10		8
Burkina Faso	27,600	13,932	\$239						
AFRI	2,240	\$701.1	\$111	43		57			
CRS	25,360	\$13,230.4	\$128				86		14
Cape Verde	20,650	3,901	\$0						
ACDI	20,650	\$3,900.9	\$0			94		6	
Chad	2,500	1,133	\$320						
AFRI	2,500	\$1,132.5	\$320	35		65			
Eritrea	550	495	\$55						
AFRI	550	\$495.0	\$55			100			
Ethiopia	61,452	29,201	\$1,289						
AFRI	1,773	\$932.8	\$58			100			
CARE	7,862	\$3,889.8	\$329	10	20	70			
CRS	12,235	\$6,509.9	\$84	18		16	2		64
EOC	8,638	\$3,897.7	\$145		10	90			
FHI	6,799	\$3,209.1	\$157	4	21	75			
REST	15,993	\$7,074.0	\$177		50	50			
SCF	2,616	\$1,341.0	\$278	65		35			
WVI	5,536	\$2,346.8	\$61		25	75			
Gambia	3,780	2,227	\$0						
CRS	3,780	\$2,227.4	\$0	66		34			
Ghana	67,080	19,094	\$432						
ADRA	16,620	\$4,037.3	\$432		1	99			
CRS	30,560	\$10,519.8	\$0	5			65		30
OICI	3,900	\$889.2	\$0			100			
TNS	16,000	\$3,648.0	\$0			100			
Guinea	2,460	2,087	\$937						
ADRA**	760	\$684.0	\$450	47				53	
AFRI	0	\$0.0	\$53	67		33			
OICI	1,700	\$1,402.5	\$434	54		46			

Appendix Table 1. FY 2000 Title II Non-Emergency Programs cont.

Country/Sponsor	Commodities		202(e) (\$'000)	% value by technical component					
	MT's	Value ('000\$)		HN	WS	AG	ED	ME#	HA
Kenya	16,070	7,562	\$254						
ADRA	1,840	\$874.0	\$33			100			
CARE	3,240	\$1,539	\$0			100			
CRS	4,060	\$1,928.5	\$0	100					
FHI	2,030	\$964.2	\$100	37		63			
TNS	3,540	\$1,681.5	\$92			100			
WVI	1,360	\$575.2	\$29			100			
Liberia	2,970	1,350	\$403						
CRS	2,970	\$1,350.0	\$403				48		52
Madagascar	15,240	7,249	\$347						
ADRA	2,960	\$1,539.2	\$99			100			
CARE	3,290	\$1,710.8	\$114		63			23	14
CRS	8,990	\$3,998.6	\$134	90		7			3
Malawi	13,020	4,726	\$0						
CRS	13,020	\$4,725.9	\$0						100
Mali	17,199	3,432	\$426						
AFRI	1,740	\$788.2	\$163	35	15	40			10
WV/WIN	15,459	\$2,643.7	\$263			100			
Mauritania	1,790	863	\$0						
Doulus	1,790	\$863.2	\$0	80					20
Mozambique	64,290	17,933	\$1,333						
ADRA	6,450	\$1,368.4	\$147			100			
AFRI	4,360	\$1,020.2	\$108	50		50			
CARE	11,360	\$2,338.0	\$239			100			
FHI	7,490	\$1,483.0	\$149	30		70			
SCF	6,230	\$1,426.3	\$105	10		90			
WVI	28,400	\$10,297.2	\$585	20		80			
Niger	13,690	6,080	\$820						
AF/CAR/CRS	13,690	\$6,080.1	\$820	19		81			
Rwanda	3,700	2,945	\$541						
ACDI	1,600	\$1,600.0	\$356			100			
CRS	0	\$0.0	\$0						100
WVI	2,100	\$1,344.6	\$185			100			
Uganda	19,970	9,512	\$745						
ACDI	8,500	\$5,325.0	\$344			89		11	
AFRI	2,670	\$974.5	\$171	23		77			
TNS	5,500	\$2,007.5	\$53			100			
WVI	3,300	\$1,204.5	\$178	10		90			

Appendix Table 1. FY 2000 Title II Non-Emergency Programs cont.

Country/Sponsor	Commodities		202(e) (\$'000)	% value by technical component					
	MT's	Value ('000\$)		HN	WS	AG	ED	ME#	HA
ASIA									
Bangladesh	67,080	15,327	\$273						
CARE	0	\$0	\$0			100			
WV	67,080	\$15,327	\$273		45	50			5
India	177,620	73,331	\$0						
CARE	124,500	\$53,087.6	\$0	98					2
CRS	53,120	\$20,243.4	\$0	26		34	10		30
<u>LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN</u>									
Bolivia	44,920	20,779	\$771						
ADRA	12,870	\$5,945.7	\$250	36	43	13	8		
CARE	10,170	\$4,794.5	\$171	62	8	30			
FHI	11,100	\$5,093.3	\$0	18	17	38	27		
PCI	10,780	\$4,945.3	\$350	10	11	46	33		
Guatemala	73,160	18,438	\$897						
CARE	15,200	\$3,913.1	\$159	59	28	13			
CRS	35,300	\$7,440.9	\$318	33		57		10	
SCF	13,440	\$3,836.7	\$174	25		70		5	
SHARE	9,220	\$3,247.2	\$245	69		31			
Haiti	79,330	21,328	\$0						
CARE	40,900	\$10,427.2	\$0	15	8	5	69		3
CRS	38,430	\$10,900.3	\$0	25			58		17
Honduras	25,810	7,345	\$0						
CARE	17,430	\$5,127.2	\$0	38		62			
CRS	8,380	\$2,217.8	\$0			100			
Nicaragua	19,740	5,424	\$582						
ADRA	4,830	\$1,301.6	\$191	58	7	21			14
PCI	6,210	\$1,759.2	\$191	14	16	28			42
SCF	8,700	\$2,362.8	\$200	39	13	23			25
Peru	74,620	45,006	\$0						
ADRA	18,440	\$9,850.6	\$0	52		48			
CARE	19,730	\$12,332.1	\$0	43		57			
CARITAS	21,810	\$13,072.7	\$0	88		12			
CRS	2,350	\$1,565.1	\$0					100	
PRISMA	10,390	\$6,919.7	\$0	100					
TNS	1,900	\$1,265.4	\$0			100			
TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS	939,481	\$348,276	\$10,663						

General notes:

HN – Health/Nutrition, WS – Water/Sanitation, AG-Agriculture/Natural resource management, ED-Education, HA-Humanitarian Assistance, ME-Microenterprise (if not part of AG component).

* Received incremental FY 1999 202(e) funding.

** FY2000 DAP approval pending